

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 27, 29, 31, 35-36 and 39-40. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 27-32, 35-36 and 38-46 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Examiner's comments

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the AAPA used to provide support for a rejection. The subject content of the Applicant's statements (5/31/08 Applicant's arguments, AAPA) is quoted here, in full,:

"The Applicant, in the Response to Final dated March 28, 2008, pointed out that the claimed object classes are defined object classes well known to one skilled in the art. The Examiner indicated that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement the same objects and cites the 36PP TS 3.172 specification as support. The Applicant claims priority to the filing date of the EP application, which is July 18, 2002. The draft of the 3GPP TS 32.172 V0.1.0 specification is dated July, 2003. So, the Applicant's description and names of the defined object classes were claimed a year before the cited art." (emphasis added)

The Applicant does not deny that a person skilled in the art (as of the date of the 3GPP specification) is aware of the objects; because of the 3GPP draft and subsequent versions. However, as stated above, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the skilled person at the time of the priority date of the Applicant's present invention was not aware of the object classes. The Applicant respectfully restates that the draft of the 3GPP specification that the Examiner cites as prior art is dated a year after the priority date of the present application and a person skilled in the art at that time would not be aware of the object classes. Therefore, the Examiner's cite is taken out of context with regard to the whole comment above and the Applicant respectfully submits that the statement made in the 5/31/2008 response is not prior art.

Examiner Objections - Claims

Claims 27-32, 35, 36, and 38-46 were objected to because of informalities. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. The Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner in order to correct the informalities. Some additional corrections were also made to correct antecedent basis. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 27-30, 40-44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant has amended these claims to correct the non-statutory subject matter in these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 27-32, 35, 36, and 38-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US 2002/0029298) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (5/31/2008 Applicant's arguments) hereinafter AAPA. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the AAPA reference is inapplicable to the rejection. With regards to the Wilson reference, Wilson discloses a management system with a managing entity and a plurality of managed systems with managed objects operated by management operations. Wilson addresses the problem of the different operations and objects that each Managed system may require. To solve this problem, Wilson provides a Mediating Managed system in charge of receiving an operation and operating managed objects without requiring the management system to be aware of which managed objects are managed at which managed system. A number of Mediating Managed systems are foreseen so that they can submit to each other those operations acting on managed objects not recognized and which other Mediating Managed system can manage to operate.

However, the Wilson reference does not teach or suggest a managed entity that includes a mapping module whereby a generic data model (SuM-GI data model) is

mapped into an internal data model in a provisioned node. Consequently, nothing in the Wilson reference teaches a generic Interface for subscription management with a data model including classes or combinations selected from at least the SubscriptionIRP, SubscriptionFunction and ServiceProviderFunction classes.

MPEP 2143 -To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Applicant respectfully submits that Wilson reference fails to disclose the use of a SuM-Generic Interface, a SuM-GI Data model, which comprises the Object classes mentioned in the independent claims. The AAPA reference from the 5/31/2008 reference is inappropriately applied as discussed above. Thus, the Examiner has not provided a prima facie case as the remaining art, Wilson, does not suggest the claimed invention. (MPEP 2142) The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27-32, 35, 36, and 38-46.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: April 22, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com